

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 16-31 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 10-15 stand withdrawn from consideration.

In the Office Action of September 5, 2007, claims 1-9 and 16-31 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 16, 27 and 30 are amended and claims 3 and 18 are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 16, 17, and 18-31 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-8, 16-23 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Fox* (U.S. Patent No. 6,566,697). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, each of independent claims 1 and 16 recites:

“said transfer transistor receives a transfer bias voltage effective to suppress current flow from said photodiode when no light is present, and

said drain transistor receives a drain bias voltage effective to suppress current flow from said photodiode when no light is present.”

In relevant part, each of independent claims 27 and 30 recites:

“said transfer transistor receives a transfer bias voltage effective to suppress current flow from said light receiving part when no light is present, and

said drain transistor receives a drain bias voltage effective to suppress current flow from said light receiving part when no light is present.”

This is clearly unlike *Fox*, which fails to disclose a transfer transistor receiving a transfer bias voltage and a drain resistor receiving a drain bias voltage to prevent current flow from a photodiode or light receiving part when no light is present. Instead, *Fox* discloses completely draining a photodiode to a storage node. (See *Fox* Col. 9, lines 15-28). Further, nowhere does *Fox* address suppressing currents generated by a photodiode or light receiving part when no light

is present. As the present application teaches, applying a transfer bias voltage to a transfer transistor and a drain bias voltage to a drain transistor successfully suppresses currents generated by a photodiode or light receiving part when no light is present. (See U.S. Pub. 2004/0130757, paragraph [0084] and [0085]). As a result, the imaging device disclosed by *Fox* is incapable of producing the imaging device claimed by Applicants.

Therefore, because *Fox* fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claims 1, 16, 27 and 30 the rejection is improper. Because claims 2, 4-9, 17, 19-26 and 28-29 depend, either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 16, 27 and 30, those claims are patentable at least for the same reasons.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 9 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fox*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1, 16, 27 and 30 are patentable over *Fox* as discussed above.

Claims 2, 4-9, 17, 19-26 and 28-29 depend, either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 16, 27 and 30, those claims are patentable at least for the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 1, 2007

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000